DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 749 FL 020 814

AUTHOR Fernandez-Vest, M. M. Jocelyne
TITLE Particles as Fundaments of Discourse Structuring.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 16p.; In: Nordic Research on Text and Discourse. NORDTEXT Symposium (Espoo, Finland, May 10-13, 1990); see FL 020 811.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Contrastive Linguistics; *Discourse Analysis; Finno Ugric Languages; Foreign Countries; Indo European Languages; *Oral Language; *Speech Communication; *Structural Analysis (Linguistics); *Written Language
IDENTIFIERS Lappish; Textual Analysis

ABSTRACT

A serious study of discourse particles (DIPs) must be founded on the analysis of orality in its two main dimensions: oral communication in its ordinary functioning (i.e., discourse, conversation, enunciation), but also in expression ritualized by the oral tradition of cultures that do not have a writing system. The association of the two dimensions emphasizes the importance of a solid theory and methodology within discourse analysis. To assume as a prerequisite a distinction between morphosyntactic and enunciative levels makes it possible to observe the role played by DIPs in the process of discourse structuring. Examples from Finno-Ugric languages with an oral tradition (the Sami language) and Indo-European languages with a long standing written tradition are examined. A dichotomic classification between particles proper (DIPs "in their own right") and particles "by extension" proves to be operational for a comparison in external contrastivity as well as internal contrastivity. (Author/JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359749

Particles as fundaments of discourse structuring

M.M.JOCELYNE FERNANDEZ-VEST

Abstract

*Apparently a category of peripheral linguistic elements, Discourse Particles (DIPs) are at the core of the present preoccupations of text linguistics for at least three reasons. A serious study of DIPs has to be founded on the analysis of orality in its two main dimensions : **oral communication** in its ordinary functioning, but also its expression ritualised by the **oral tradition** of cultures which do not have a writing system. The association of the two dimensions emphasizes the importance of a solid theory and methodology within discourse analysis. The distinction between the morphosyntactic and the enunciative levels stated here as a prerequisite enables us to observe the central role played by DIPs in the process of discourse structuring. Examples from Finno-Ugric languages with an oral tradition (the Sami language) as well as of Indo-European languages with a long standing written tradition (cf. the use of DIPs in lexical research in spoken French) are examined. A dichotomic classification between particles proper (DIPs "in their own right") and particles "by extension" proves to be operational for a comparison in **external contrastivity** (examples taken from bilingual discourses within mixed French-Finnish families) as well as **internal contrastivity** (see the reduction and semantic fixation of the DIPs when oral languages become written).*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tove Ahlbäck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL020814

1. Introduction

Under the harmless appearance of a category of peripheral linguistic elements, difficult to classify and even to denominate, "**particles**" are in fact situated at the core of the current preoccupations of linguistics in general and of **text linguistics** in particular. This for at least three reasons.

1.1.

Although linguists have since the beginnings of modern linguistics, already at the time of European comparativism in the 19th century, and still more clearly at the time of classical structuralism, recognized or even proclaimed the **primacy of the oral language**, still relatively few significant studies have been devoted to this domain of language expression. A serious study of particles has to be founded essentially, even though not exclusively, on the analysis of **orality** in its two main dimensions. The materials (corpora) providing the examples used for the demonstration will optimally have to take into account **two dimensions of orality** which should not be confused : on the one hand, **oral communication** in its ordinary functioning (nowadays treated under the labels of "discourse", "conversation" or even, from a more theoretic point of view, "enunciation"), this "**impromptu speech**" which Östman (1982) coined as

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"symbiotically related" to the particles, and on the other hand, the **oral tradition** represented by cultures which do not have a writing system ("orature"?). The interest of this double approach also lies in the association of two dimensions that are generally kept apart by specialists. **Pragmatics** and **sociolinguistics** are thus applied to the analysis of widely used languages and urban societies, whereas **ethnolinguistics** and **anthropological linguistics** confine themselves to the observation of languages with an oral tradition transmitted within extra-European agrarian communities.

1.2.

As a consequence of this first point, the choice of these small elements called "particles" also hinges on one of the domains most actively promoted by linguistic research as well as by language teaching during the last ten years: with the expansion of the so-called connexe sciences (pragmatics, socio- and psycholinguistics), **discourse analyses**.

As a reaction against the undisciplined expansion of the domain, this study will aim at defining and delimiting as closely as possible its object and methods. The approach is indeed **textual**, which implies that it subordinates the analysis of utterances (or sentences) to that of the ***discursive whole***, but it does not imply, in our view, and contrary to a trend which is dominant today, automatically favour para- and extralinguistic factors to the detriment of forms and structures. Let us note though that **prosody** (intonation, pause, rhythm, tempo), indispensable as it is in interpreting oral phenomena, is for us an integral part of the linguistic structure - unlike for certain schools of structuralist obedience. As another implication of our initial choices (orality and discourse), the present analysis will state the relation of **interlocution** as primary; the collected corpora will be mainly **dialogical**; the theory under elaboration is based upon the definition of a minimal utterance which is **communicative** in nature. This utterance takes the form of a short utterance, with a single constituent - most often a "predicate" in syntactic terms -, which carries a falling intonation, i.e. an intonation charged with marking the "Rheme", in semantic or enunciative terms (cf. Fernandez 1987a: 581-584.).

In other words, this analysis states as a prerequisite a distinction between the **morphosyntactic** and the **enunciative** levels (following the theories of the Prague School, as well as those of certain well-known linguists in the French-speaking world, such as Hagège, 1982, 1985, and Lazard, 1979).

1.3.

The discursive activity mentioned above will be described in the context of **language contact**. The study concerns **Contrastive Linguistics**, another essential component of General Linguistics, as well as the problem of multilingualism and the evolution of minority languages, especially in a European context (we shall refer to the status and functioning of the "**interlanguage**" of migrants for instance).

2. Why discursive particles ? (DIPs)

DIPs (I call them PENs for "Particules Enonciatives" in French, let us call them DIPs in English) were until recently the ***persona non grata*** of stylistic, grammatical and even linguistic description. Often qualified as "fillers" ("empty/expletive"), they are the first to be cut from edited texts - i.e corrected texts. One can provide many examples of this, taken from grammar books as well as from modern works that claim the natural style of recorded interviews. But in impromptu speech these particles are **numerous** (English "well", "say", "like", I guess", "I mean", "you know") - which we have been able to verify by comparing the published texts with their original recordings. It does not therefore seem irrelevant to devote a monograph to particles, to rehabilitate them in their natural functioning, and thus to determine their precise grammatical functioning. The poor representation of particles in pedagogical works is due to this double difficulty: difficulty of the **gloss** (how can one verbalize a meaning which is directly linked to the context?) as well as difficulty of **translation** (DIPs are generally lacking in language handbooks).

Our ***choice of terminology*** among the multitude of variants met in modern discourse analyses ("punctuators", "modal/sentence adverbs", "connectors", "gambits", etc.) is justified by our concern to emphasize the **contradiction** inherent in these elements: they have little phonic and syntactic weight (short words, often monosyllabic, further reduced by colloquial pronunciation; fluctuating classification in the grammars), yet they are essential for the functioning of discourse. This explains our concern to associate "Particle" and a concept referring to a field which is central in linguistic research nowadays: enunciation. (**Enunciation**, a French variant of "Pragmatics", has the same historical origins - grammar but above all rhetoric (from Aristotle to Perelman, 1970) and certain philosophical schools (from Hegel's phenomenology to the philosophers of "ordinary language", Austin, Strawson, Searle). The enunciative standpoint, which is a reaction against extensional logic and structural linguistics, tends to reintegrate the **subject** into the system of the language itself. This integration, which relies upon certain explicit **subjective categories**

(person, deixis, modality - see Benveniste, 1970), aims at locating the traces of language **operations** in discourse. The enunciative approach is thus also a denial of the famous dichotomies (between "langue/parole" and "competence/performance"). The enunciative theories are not homogeneous, but they have in common a certain **conception of semantics**: **solutions** of **continuity** are preferred to clear-cut dichotomies, and particular attention is paid to the diversity of realisations of a single category. Emphasis is given to **semantic shift** rather than to "discrete unities", **glides** between central and secondary values (Culioli, 1975-76, Pottier 1974, 1987) - for a comparison between text linguistics and French enunciative theories, see Fernandez (1988).)

3. DIPs and the construction of discourse

The systematic study of these particles in oral material, taken at first from the only indigenous Fenno-Scandinavian language which, until recently, was **exclusively oral** (a unified orthography was adopted in 1979), **Sami** ("Lappish"), allows us to state some of the universal tendencies of particles:

3.1.

Particles show the **concomitance of elaboration and production**, the primary characteristics of oral discourse. These particles build up the syntactic units into a spoken **chain of rhythmic units**. It is a way for the speaker to **scan** the progress of his thought. (A comparable use of the particles can be observed in the traditional northern **yoik**.) An example of a categorical negative response (answer of "confirmation of invalidation" - according to our typology, Fernandez, 1987a : 390-531) in Sami :

(1) (Q. - So you have been telling a lot of lies to this old man ?)
- In dal gielistan in leat gal in fal in álgage.
I not (neg.v.) sure (DIP) lied I not (neg.v.) have certainly (DIP) I not (neg.v.) only (DIP) I not (neg.v.) the beginning+even (DIP)
"Oh no I have not lied, certainly not, I simply have not, I have not even tried to."

3.2.

Consequently, the role of **structuring** of the particles is decisive: if the response-utterance does not contain any particle, or contains a limited number of particles of a standard nature (such as "Yes/of course/indeed"), the sequence will most often be

modelled upon that of the question. On the other hand, the presence of numerous particles brings about a redistribution of the rhythmic units, i.e. of the order of constituents, for example in Sami :

(2) (Q. - Was there very little money at that time or ?)
- Na gal dat uhccán leai dalle dan áigge ruhta
open. DIP affirm.DIP DIP little was then (adv.) at that time money (nom.)
"Well yes sure there was very little then at that time money".

As to the **semantic** value of the particles, one can easily show through the comparison of examples borrowed from diverse languages that these particles lack an individual meaning: their informative value in **interlocution** (complicity, connivance, hierarchical differences between partners ...), in **modalisation** of the utterance, and even in the subtle question of **affectivity** within language (the speaker suggests an implication, refutes a presupposition, manifests his attitude or his judgement without explicitly verbalising), emerges clearly from the confrontation of varied situations of enunciation. One need only refer to the **bibliography** edited by Weydt and Ehlers (1987) to see the impressive number of studies devoted to these "**modalpartikeln**" (in Weydt's research group's terms) from the point of view of **interaction**.

At the **enunciative** level, the functioning of articles forces us to make an incursion into the controversial domain of thematisation. We know today, thanks to the proliferation of studies of diverse languages, what the **main devices** are for thematising an utterance, which I list here briefly:

In the Theme/Rheme opposition, **intonation** is a universal feature, always present; focalisation and emphasis are accompanied by an **accent of intensity**, distinct from the sentence accent. The other devices of thematisation available are:

- elements traditionally considered as prepositional or prepositional locutions (Germ. **betreffs**, Engl. **as for**, Fr. **quant à**); suffixes; discontinuate structures; morphological changes; changes of word order;
- ***particles***: Japanese (**wa**), Korean, Tongan, Thai, etc. have been specially studied.

4. Particles and textual linguistics

From the point of view of text linguistics, there are two kinds of particles which are of special interest:

4.1. The particles "proper" (or DIPs "in their own right")

On the one hand we have the DIPs that, sharing neither phonological nor morphological identity with any other elements of the language, fulfil exclusively the function of structuring the discursive flow. The richness of a language in particles of this type (as in the case of Sami, in which many of these Particles are grammaticalised) can be considered as the corollary of a **long oral tradition**. You have in (3) an extract from a dialogue between two old Sami informants - with a competence totally untouched by schooling.

(3) **a - (AUL) Man GUHKKI dás dáppe dohko du báikái Bá osii / die átgo olu / dáppe girkobáikkes ?**
b - (JAG) Goal mo bat dal dat lea ? Galhan dat lea vissa .... beannot miilla vai .... gal dat guokte miilla lea gal .
c - Eambbo dat gal lea.
d - Gal dat liikká lea eambbo ga .
e - Ammal .. ammal jo VIHTTA miilla gal lea dákko Deatnorái.
f - I LEAT ban nu .. I DAT leat nu. Go i leat vihtta miilla na .... Gal dat dohko .. dál dohko Nuvvosii gal lea vihtta.
g - Já. (...)

a - *Quelle distance* y a-t-il d'ici précisément à là-bas à ton domicile à Báos/*sais-tu* combien/depuis ici depuis le bourg ?
b - *Combien peut-il bien* y avoir ? *Ah oui pour sûr* il y a *sans doute* .... un mille et demi *ou alors* .... oui il y a *bien* deux milles *sûrement* .
c - Plus il y a *sûremen* .
d - C'est vrai il y a *quand même* plus *sûremen* .
e - *Peut-être bien .. peut-être bien* CINQ milles *oui* il y a depuis ici le long du Deatnu.
f - AH NON alors là .. *Ah ÇA non* alors. Puisqu'il n'y a *pas* cinq milles *enfin* .... *C'est vrai* jusque là-bas .. maintenant jusque là-bas à Nuvvos *oui* il y en a cinq.
g - *Ah bon.* (...)
(From the French translation of the extensive text, cf. Fernandez, 1987a: 585-589)

In this dialogue, even though the collaboration between partners comes out essentially from the quick changing of Q and A, the Q and A seldom have a specific shape, and they appear as variants of **assertive** utterances. This results from the dominating role played by the enunciative particles, 44 DIPs for 16 turns, the DIPs assuming the structuring as well as the cohesion of the discourse. The basic meaning of this discourse, which is aimed at the evaluation of a distance, could not even come through, in spite of a multitude of deictic adverbs, without being framed and carried forward by the DIPs.

A comparison of the DIPs in the three main languages spoken in Finland, Sami, Finnish and Swedish, made evident that Sami is the most flexible of the three (cf.

Fernandez, 1986, 1987a: 599-603). The DIPs are criteria for the evaluation of the **degree of orality** of the three languages, not only because of their quantitative superiority. It is definitely the **qualitative difference** between the DIPs in Sami as opposed to those in Finnish and Swedish which is the main **trace left in synchrony** by a diachronically codified oral expression.

One could be tempted, on the basis of the descriptions of various oral languages, to distinguish a class of "**demarcatives**". From a theoretical point of view, the phenomenon would be extremely interesting if it could be proved to be used in most languages: it would be one of the best definitions available of the sentence. But things are more complex, as these particles rarely seem to be neutral (they often have an interrogative or modal value, as in Chinese for instance). The most obvious type of demarcative seems to be in fact a **correlative** of subordinate clauses: it is found in Indo-European languages (Germ. **so, dann**, Fr. **alors** after condition) as well as in various African and Amerindian languages (e.g. in Ewe in Togo and Ghana, in Wayâpi in French Guyana, cf. Feuillet, 1988: 213 ff.).

A kind of correlative/demarcative has also been noticed in the Sami language: the particle **de**, very frequent at the beginning of a minimal affirmative response, is even found at the beginning of a main clause in an "elaborate" response, after a circumstancial clause (generally causal or temporal), as for example in:

(4) Q. - Die átgo ↑ / Do you know ? / *Th* — R. De die án ↓ / Yes I know. / *Rh*

- Go leat gullan ↑ / *Th* / When you have heard — de die át ↓ / *Rh* / (then) you will know.

This parallelism of use emphasises the **informative analogy** betwen the two constructions (in spite of their syntactical difference): in the binary syntactic-prosodical structure **subordinate clause + main clause** as well as in the pair **Q + R** the element introduced by the particle has a function of **Rheme** (Fernandez, 1987a: 563).

4.2. Particles "by extension"

These particles can be identified as other parts of discourse (circumstancial adverbs, personal and demonstrative pronouns mostly): they appear as their "**desemanticised**" variant. This brings us back to a central question in linguistics, i.e. the progressive **demotivation of lexemes** as a natural process in the creation of **cohesive operators**. It can even be shown in several languages that some complements of

place/time/manner gradually lose their meaning and become mere binding conjunctions. Some of the syntagms or phrases functioning as discursive particles have recently been studied in Swedish by Aijmer (1985, **vaghetsmarkörer** - "markers of vagueness)" and Saari (1984, **förstår du, ser du**, "you see", etc.).

As for **French**, it is especially from the angle of "**paraphrastic reformulation**" (Gülich and Kotschi, 1983), and from the point of view of "**discursive and metadiscursive punctuation**" (Winther, 1985) that these markers have been studied. The latest book by Moeschler (1989) contains several chapters about **connectors**, several methods of analysis are proposed: enunciative/structural/functional/ inferential. One can also mention the growing importance given to the particles by theoreticians of **formal linguistics** (Culioli's metalinguistic operations) and **logico-discursive linguistics** (Ducrot and his well-known polyphony).

The theorisation of these questions nowadays takes advantage of many innovative works within and about the French-speaking world at large ("**francophonie**"), for instance Canadian research on regional French (at the Universities of Montreal and Laval, a Ph.D. thesis was presented a couple of years ago by Diane Vincent upon "Punctuators in Quebec French"), and also benefits from European research on the **interlanguage of migrants** (a project originally sponsored by the European Science Foundation) - cf. Perdue (ed., 1986).

Confronted as we were with the problem within a project about the bilingualism and/or interlanguage of French-Finnish families, we naturally met the alternative offered to the linguist specializing in oral syntax, and formulated thus by N.E. Enkvist:

> - should [the linguist] actually try to write a special description - grammar - covering all the structures he finds on the surface of his impromptu texts ? (...)
> - should he rather derive the deviant patterns by special transfer rules out of well-formed sentences ? (Introduction, Enkvist, ed., 1982)

I personally chose to test some of the methods of analysis developed by one of the few French syntacticians engaged in research on spoken language, i.e. the **GARS** (Groupe Aixois de Recherche en Syntaxe, Univ. of Provence), and specially by its director, Claire Blanche-Benveniste. Different investigations were carried out into the phenomenon of so called "**Listing**" (i.e. a lexical inventory commonly known as "spluttering", Fr. "bafouillage"), a phenomenon so common in spoken language that we felt that some status backed up by a coherent syntactic theory should be given to it. These works gave us the opportunity to observe once again the **structuring role of particles.**

The original hypothesis stated by the GARS researchers was that there must exist a relation between the syntactic structures and the phenomena of repetition-hesitation,

apparently unpredictable but universally used. The aim was in other words to verify that **"spluttering" is, partly at least, regulated by grammar.** The method is to convert the text into syntactically analysable sequences, not by modifying the produced text, but by drawing some of the occurrences out of the syntagmatic axis. This "listing" happens within a paradigmatic class, and one will leave on the syntagmatic axis only the elements actually linked by syntagmatic dependencies. The graphic representation thus, besides facilitating the reading of the transcription, is itself the first stage of the analysis: it shows where the text is at a standstill and where it goes forth (Blanche-Benveniste, 1987, 1989).

I will now go through some of the examples taken from our contrastive project. The central role of the DIPs, connected thus with a search for words, emerges clearly in the construction of **synonymy**:

(5) - **Et puis avec l'habitude /**
bon ben avec le temps .... on s'y fait. (DOF15, 2)
- And then with habit/ well you know with time .... one gets used to it

DIPs also participate in the interactive search for **precision**, often connected with self-correction, as for example in:

(6) - **C'est pas .. c'est pas vraiment/.... comment dire ? .. tehokas. >>C'est pas .. (- efficace) EFFICACE voilà. C'est pas cent pour cent quoi.** (DOF6B,4)
- It's not .. it's not really/.... how could I say ? .. tehokas.>>It's not .. (- efficient). EFFICIENT that's it. It's not a hundred per cent I mean.

(7) - **D'abord dans les les champs. Ensuite ... Dans les champs/oui dans/pas dans les chants "A-a" (chante) mais dans les champs oui dans ... (- non non dans l'agriculture È ....) Dans l'agriculture voilà. A ramasser des patates quoi ! (rient)** (DOF6, 3)
- First in the the fields. Then .... In the fields/ yes in/not in the songs* "A-a" (*sings*) but in the fields yes in .... (- oh no in agriculture.....) In agriculture that's it. Picking up spuds I mean ! *(they laugh)*
* Fr. "champ/chant", homonyms, "field/song", respectively.

DIPs intervene also to underline the **effects** of Listing, which can be a so-called **"lexical break"**, i.e. the apparent failure which finds expression in explicit interrogations about the lexical filling, or even in a **lexical void** marked by "comment dirais-je ?"/"comment ça s'appelle ?" (how could I say/what was it called again ?) - or even by "je sais pas" (I don't know). These expressions will, or will not, according to different contextual factors, be interpreted as direct appeals to the addressee. For example:

(8) - **et ça m'avait déjà donné quand même une .. une idée/je sais pas/quelque chose de France. Et je ne sais pas si c'est à/à cause de ça que j'ai choisi** () (DOF8,3)
- and it had already given me anyway an .. an idea/I don't know/something from France. And I don't know whether it was/it was because of that I chose ()

At the outcome of this search, the speaker tends to **validate** (or **invalidate**) the results: this happens through particles of modalisation - "enfin/c'est sûr/oui/non" (well/ sure/yes/no), as in the following example:

(9) - **la communauté ORTHODOXE .. enfin le .. oui/la paroisse/la communauté È .... orthodoxe essaie de/de de faire son possible** (DOF6,9)
- the ORTHODOX community .. well the .. yes/the parish/the orthodox .... community tries to/tries to to do its best

The **affinity** initially presupposed between the constructed elements and the "spluttering" has been verified through several types of comparison, for instance between prepositions/conjunctions in their constructed/vs. associated use respectively, for instance "comme", "pour" (as, as for), for example in:

(10) - **elle l'a re .. ressenti /un peu comme/un peu beaucoup hein comme un milieu SNOB** (DOF6,16)
- she felt that it was /a bit of a/a bit well quite a bit of a SNOBBISH environment

What about **external contrastivity**, with Finnish in this case ? The main difference proves to be the rarity of "listings" (lexical inventories) without junctors: in Finnish the internal organization of an enumerative list implies several **että** "that" and **ja** "and", as in:

(11) - **selvä ett nainen nainenhan aina .... josutaa ja liikkuu ja .... jättää työnsä jättää kaikki ja (*rit*) lähtee.** (DOF4B,5)
- clear that woman woman sure always .... hurries and moves and .... leaves her job leaves everything and (laughs) goes away

One finds also so-called "bribes en amorce" (the repetition of the first constituent in a NP or VP , "priming fragment" ?) but generally with a transition operated by the Particle, as in

(12) - **Se tuo sehän tuo hyviä asioita** (DOF3B,5)
- It brings it brings you know good things

The role of DIPs for organizing the search in synonymy is specially evident, as for example in:

(13) - **Joo kyll se tuntu se tuntu niinku OUDOLTA siis se tuntu keinotekoselta** (DOF4B,2)
- Yeah yes it feels it feels like STRANGE thus it feels artificial

The real degree of affinity between "constructed" elements and "spluttering" is difficult to evaluate because of these multiple delaying (stalling ?) processes which seem to function more mechanically without junctors than the French listings. But the affinity comes out in several syntagms, for instance the "local cases": there will often be spluttering when the case is constructed by the verb, as in

(14) - **me tavattiin tota/.. me tavattiin Kööpenhaaminassa** (DOF6B,7)
- we met well/.. we met in Copenhagen

5. DIPs in oral vs. written language

As for a textual approach to the functioning of the DIPs in oral and written language respectively, I shall essentially suggest two directions for research.

5.1. The functioning of DIPs when an oral language becomes written.

The **Sami** language has been a privileged field for this type of observation as well. With the implantation of a unified language in that quickly changing society (the children are nowadays provided with schooling in their 1st language, a written literature is developing, gaining more and more independence from the oral tradition), during the last ten years one has been able to observe a gradual transformation of the role of the DIPs. Their number tends to be reduced, their meaning tends to be limited to marginal values. An interesting chapter in this respect is the use of the particles made by the writers of this "young" literature, a compromise between the traditional and the modern use. In (15) and (16) you find two examples of this: one from poetry, from the trilogy by N.A. Valkeapää, published in Swedish in 1987, and one from prose, from the novel by J.A. Vest, published in Norwegian in 1989. The Scandinavian translations and even more so the French ones show the difficulties of transferring the values into other languages.

While there are only a few examples in the poems in which the Swedish and not the French version has had to leave out the DIPs (ex. Sa. **Dathan gal leat olu/dat dagut ....**; Sw. **Många är/de gärningar** ...; Fr. **Certes ils ne manquent pas/les actes ...**), there are a great many in which the enunciative modality carried by the Sami DIPs has simply been wiped out by the French, but has been partially rendered by the Swedish, as for example in (15):

(15) **Sa. Jápmin ja riegádeapmi**
Dathan leat olbmo
deháleamosássit

Jus eallimis ii huma

Ja máidba das hupmat
dathan lea nu árgabeaivválas

Sw. Döden och födelsen
Människans viktigaste stunder
Om man inte talar om livet

Vad då tala om
det är ju så alldagligt

Fr. Mort et naissance
voilà bien l'essentiel pour l'homme
A moins de parler de la vie

Mais pourquoi en parler
c'est si trivial le quotidien

Here the first part of the Swedish text was preferred to be left free of particles (its neutrality emphasizes the generality of a serious assertion), but in the second part the pair "**då/ju**" in the Question-Response pair works perfectly as an equivalent of the Sami.

The prose test is still more convincing: within three turns, the quantitative difference is more than double - 12 DIPS in the Sami dialogue, 5 or less in the other two.

(16) **Sa. Jos eadni geahccalii skuldot, de áhcci lávii álo bealustit iezas seammaláhkai.**
- Iezahan dal álge. In dal divttege gal amas rivgu vuortnuhit iezan.
- Muhto ieshan don bahkket dohko, it astta bargat dálubargguid. (...)
- Ferte dat gal giinu doaladit minge beali. Mu uihan mii áibas duolmmahallat. Dievva gávppi lea gal olmmos, muhto eai sáhte dalle jienádit go galggasii. Eai leat gaskaneaset ruodjamin.

No. Hvis hun la til å kritisere far for all denne kranglinga, hadde han alltid svaret rede:
- Det e ho sjael som begynne. Ae kan da ikke la ei fremmen finska få lov til å drive og plage mae.
- Men det e jo du sjael som absolutt vil dit. Og tid til gårdsarbeid det har du ikke. (...)
- Nån må ta på sae å snakke for oss. Ellers kommer vi snart helt under støvelen. Fullt av folk e det i butiken, men ikke en kjeft som greie å si fra ! Ellers e de rett høgmaelt nok.

Fr. Que ma mère s'avisat de lui faire des reproches, et mon père avait sa défense toute prête.
- C'est elle quoi qui a commencé. Je ne vais tout de même pas laisser une Finnoise me faire la leçon.
- Mais c'est toi qui t'imposes, tu trouves pas le temps de t'occuper des travaux de la ferme. (...)
- Il faut bien que quelqu'un reste là pour défendre nos intérêts aussi. Parce que sinon on sera vite piétiné. Ah y a foule oui dans la boutique, mais ils savent pas dire fève quand il faudrait. C'est autre chose quand ils braillent entre eux.

A word by word comparison shows how the effect of "oral style" is often a question of choice for the translator, whereas in the articulation of the Sami dialogue the "particle structure" (or rather "process") seems to be an unavoidable mechanism.

5.2.

Finally, the relation between oral and written discourse can be approached through **Languages for Special Purposes**, LSP, i.e. a pole of communication diametrically opposed to impromptu speech. To what extent is the role of DIPs compatible with a code determined by an institutional praxis ? What is the respective proportion of DIPs vs. logico-syntactic connectors in the light of the two main types of contrastivities - internal (e. g. scientific discourse versus popularising discourse) and external contrastivity? You will find in (17) the (simulated) Finnish translation of a French period from an economic journal :

(17) () **mahdollinen rahan nosto-oikeuden rajoittaminen; näin/hän tapahtui vuonna 1968 toukokuun tapahtumien ensimmäisinä päivinä**
probable argent-de retrait-droit-de limitation; ainsi+PEN arriva
année 1968 mai-de événements-de premiers jours-aux
"C'est ce qui se produisit, on le sait, aux premiers jours des événements de mai 1968", i.e.

"That is, as you know, what happened during the first days of the events in May 1968", an idiomatic reformulation of the French original utterance ("[plusieurs mesures conservatoires parmi lesquelles une probable limitation des retraits] comme cela s'est fait aux premiers jours de mai 1968", "... different measures among which a probable limitation of withdrawals (of cash/money)" - cf. Fernandez (1987b).

The use of the enclitic particle **-han/-hän** in Finnish (studied in different types of texts by Hakulinen, 1976 : 1-61, (ed.) 1989: 115-146), one of the functions of which is precisely to indicate that the utterance must be treated as involving mutual knowledge, allows the Finnish text a more flexible articulation than its French equivalent.

I shall now put an end to this otherwise practically unlimited inventory of the textual dimensions of DIPs, hoping that I have somehow managed to convince the reader that the choice of **"punctuators" (particles)** as an introduction to a symposium with **macrostructural** ambitions was not motivated solely by a subjective taste for paradox or even for provocation.

REFERENCES

Aijmer, K. (1985). Vad man ej klart kan säga - om vaghetsmarkörer. *Svenskans beskrivning*, 15: 107-117.

Benveniste, E. (1970). L'appareil formel de l'énonciation. *Langages*, 17: 12-18.

Blanche-Benveniste, C. (1987). Syntaxe, choix de lexique et lieux de bafouillage. *DRLAV*, 36-37 (Dialogue du marivaudage et de la machine): 123-157.

- (1989). Les régulations syntaxiques dans les productions de français parlé. *LINX*, 20 (Analyse grammaticale de corpus oraux): 7-20.

Culioli, A. (1975-1976). *Transcription du seminaire de DEA: "Recherche en linguistique, theorie des operations enonciatives"*. Paris: Université de Paris VII.

Ducrot, O. (1984). *Le dire et le dit*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.

Enkvist, N.E. (ed., 1982). *Impromptu Speech: A Symposium*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation, 78.

Fernandez(-Vest), M.M.J. (1986). Word order and enunciative particles in the Sami ("Lappish") dialogue - a contrastive and panchronic approach. In *Festschrift für István Futaky*, W. Veenker (ed.) Hamburg: Buske: 113-125

- (1987a). *Le discours des Sames - Oralité, contrastes, énonciation*. Paris: Didier Erudition.

- (1987b). Réénoncer pour traduire et vulgariser: le discours économique. In *Traduction et vulgarisation scientifique, Actes du IIe Colloque Contrastif DISCOSS*, Fernandez (ed.), Paris: DISCOSS: 23-42.

- (1988). La linguistique textuelle en Fenno-Scandie - contribution originale à la pensée énonciative du XXe siècle?. *Histoire - Epistémologie - langage*, X (1): 131-150.

Feuillet, J. (1988). *Introduction à l'analyse morphosyntaxique*. Paris: PUF (Linguistique nouvelle).

Gülich, E. and Kotschi, Th. (1983). Partikeln als Paraphrasen - Indikatoren (am Beispiel des Französischen). In *Partikeln und Interaktion* , H. Weydt (ed.): Tübingen : Niemeyer: 249-262.

Hagège, C. (1982). *La structure des langues*. Paris: PUF (Que sais-je?)

- (1985). *L'Homme de paroles*. Paris: Fayard.

Hakulinen, A. (1976). *Reports on Text Linguistics: Suomen kielen generatiivista lauseoppia, 2*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation, 7.

Hakulinen, A. (ed., 1989). *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja, I*. Helsingin yliopisto: suomen kielen laitos (Kieli, 4).

Lazard, G.(1979). Actance variations and categories of the object. In *Ergativity. Towards a theory of grammatical relations*, F. Plank (ed.), London-New York: 269-292.

Moeschler, J. (1989). *Modélisation du dialogue. Représentation de l'inférence argumentative*. Paris: Hermès.

Perdue, C. (ed., 1986). *L'acquisition du français par des adultes immigrés: aspects psycholinguistiques; Langages, 84*.

Perelman, C. (1970). *Le champ de l'argumentation*. Bruxelles: Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles (Université libre de Bruxelles, Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, XLIII).

Pottier, B. (1974). *Linguistique générale. Théorie et description*. Paris: Klincksieck.

- (1987). *Théorie et analyse en linguistique*. Paris: Hachette (Langue, linguistique, communication).

Saari, M. (1984). Några pragmatiska partiklar i svenskt talspråk. In *Festschrift till Åke Granlund; Studier i nordisk filologi*, 65, L. Huldén and C-E. Thors (eds.), Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet (Skrifter utgivna av SLS, 517: 213-222.

Vincent, D. (1986). Que fait la sociolinguistique avec l'analyse de discours et vice-versa? *Langage et société*, 38: 7-17.

Weydt, H. and Ehlers, K-H. (1987). Partikel-Bibliographie. *Internationale Sprachenforschung zu Partikeln und Interjektionen.* Frankfurt am Main - Bern - New York - Paris: Peter Lang.

Winther, A. (1985). Bon (bien, très bien) : Ponctuation discursive et ponctuation métadiscursive. *Langue française* (L'oral du débat), 65: 80-91.

Östman, J.O. (1982). The symbiotic relationship between pragmatic particles and impromptu speech. N.E. Enkvist (ed.): 147-177.

After writing two dissertations about Finnish minorities (1. The Swedish-speaking Radio theatre, 1971; 2. Finnish spoken by bilingual Samis, 1977, published in 1982), M.M.Jocelyne Fernandez (b. 1947) was awarded the "State Doctorate" at the University of Paris (Paris V - René Descartes) in 1984 for a thesis entitled "Contrastive Discourse, Orality and Multilingualism: the Communicative Space of Sami, Finnish and Swedish (in Finland)".Formerly a Lecturer in Scandinavian studies at the University of Rennes II (1969-78), M.M.J.F. is at present a Research Professor in the French National Centre for Scientific Research (C.N.R.S.). In charge of the European Section of the Laboratory of Languages and Civilisations with Oral Traditions (LACITO) and Director of Studies (General linguistics) at the University of Paris V, M.M.J.F. has published over 60 articles on Fenno-Scandinavian languages and literatures, contrastive linguistics and discourse typology; 10 books, among which *Le discours des Sames*, Didier Erudition, 1987; *Les particules énonciatives*, PUF, in press; among collected papers, *Traduction et vulgarisation scientifique*, DISCOSS, 1987.